DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 613 CS 206 941

AUTHOR Picard, Robert G.
TITLE Democratic Socialism: Toward a Fifth Theory of the Press.
PUB DATE Jul 82
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (65th, Athens, OH, July 25-28, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Democracy; Developed Nations; *Economic Factors; Freedom of Speech; *Government Role; Information Sources; Journalism; *Newspapers; News Reporting; *Social Influences; *Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Democratic Socialism; Media Ownership; *Media Role

ABSTRACT

For more than 25 years, the "four theories" paradigm has been dominant in the study of the relationships among the press, society, and the state. Asserting that the major approaches to such study are the libertarian, social responsibility, authoritarian, and Soviet/communist theories, this paradigm fails to account for economic and social pressures that have led to a decline in newspaper plurality and opinions available in Western democratic societies. A new theory has recently emerged to fill this gap. The theory, which arose from democratic socialist ideology, holds that state intervention in the structure and operation of the press should be encouraged to counteract effects of private control and to support the role of the press in the democratic process by promoting democratic control, as well as unit, communicator, and message plurality in the press. The theory proposes alternative ownership and management forms that would make the press public utilities to be used as tools by people to disseminate their aspirations, ideas, and opinions. The theory is based on the belief that freedom of the press is a right accorded citizens in a democracy and not a privilege reserved only to those who own or control the media. The theory holds that economic and social pressures on the press must be eased if press freedom is to be preserved. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218613

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

QS

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM: TOWARD A FIFTH THEORY OF THE PRESS

By
Robert G. Picard
Publications Editor

Freedom of Information Center
School of Journalism
University of Missouri

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert G. Picard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the Qualitative Studies Division, Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Athens, Ohio, July 1982

CS206941

> State intervention has reached a stage at which a new formulation is required for the traditional press ethic based upon a total separation of powers between authority and media. We can no longer pretend that information or media enterprises are utterly private enterprises existing at the convergence point of supply and demand.
>
> --Anthony Smith[1]

For a quarter century the dominant paradigm in the study of the relationships between press, society and the state has been Four Theories of the Press, which asserts that the major approaches are represented by the libertarian, social responsibility, authoritarian and Soviet/communist theories.[2]

In the Western democratic world the libertarian and social responsibility theories have been dominant, but these approaches have increasingly come under attack since they have failed to account for pressures and controls on the press that have disrupted the marketplace for ideas and diminished the appearance of diverse ideas and opinions. The major impetus for the criticism has been dramatic newspaper mortality and concentration of ownership, particularly in Nordic and European nations since the 1940s, that have seriously impaired the press' ability to carry out its role as a political forum and educator.

A review of such concentration in the U.S. newspaper industry, and of the existing literature on the development, led Patrick Parsons to conclude that the creation and maintenance of economies of scale in the newspaper industry are the primary cause of the decline of daily newspapers and of competing newspapers.[3] Parsons' work, which has received little notice, showed that newspapers operate in accordance with the primary functions, goals and motivations of all industries in a capitalist free market system. He also concluded that when faced with

difficulties in the marketplace, papers made changes not to serve the community better but to make the papers more salable--efforts ultimately doomed to failure, according to Lars Engwall, who has argued that only by differentiating the content or audience of competing newspapers can more than one survive in a given market.[4] The Commission of the European Communities reached conclusions similar to Parsons' in its individual studies on press competition and concentration in European nations published in its Evolution of Concentration and Competition series.

Mortality and concentration can be seen in all industries in which individual enterprises are subject to the market forces of the capitalist economic system. A reality of that system is that maximum profits are not made in competition with other enterprises, but in the absence of competition. Since newspapers are, with rare exception, profit-making ventures--not public information utilities--it should not be surprising that capitalistic market strategies have been pursued that have spurred the decline of independent newspapers.

These developments have disrupted the forum of ideas in such a way that the introduction and debate of divergent opinions and ideas have been significantly impaired. This has raised concern among political scientists, sociologists, journalists and others interested in the contributions of newspapers to society and the political process and has prompted them to reconsider Milton's view of the marketplace of ideas and the self-correcting aspects of the market. Supporters of the libertarian view of the market have long argued that the market must be "free" if it is to operate according to the theory. George Koether typifies this view when he says that "...a 'market' cannot truly be a market unless it operates by the free choices of its consumers and

producers. If it is not free, it is no longer a market."[5] Proponents of this view recognize that government can interfere with freedom in the market, but generally do not accept the idea that economic and social pressures can be equally as devastating by removing free choices for consumers and producers. Other libertarians, however, recognize the insufficiency of that position, although they do not accept the intervention of the state to correct the problems.

Since the commercial nature of communication makes it difficult to bring new ideas onto the scene and has resulted in actions that control the marketplace, it becomes necessary to consider what has happened to the marketplace since it was described by Milton and to take action to make the marketplace operate more freely once again. It is no longer enough to argue that those with viewpoints not carried in readily available media should seek out other media for those views. With subscriptions to a newspaper from another locality running as much as $300 a year, news magazine subscriptions reaching $50 a year and subscriptions to journals of opinion and specialty magazines costing between $12-25 per year, one could easily spend $1,000 a year seeking diversity, something well beyond the means of most individuals. And libraries no longer offer the answer to the problem either since government cutbacks have caused them to reduce periodical subscriptions at the expense of serials with unorthodox viewpoints.

Starting competing newspapers or periodicals with significant distribution is also out of the question because of the costs of labor, distribution, printing and editorial materials. "In a sprawling country like America, coverage in the mass media is the only means of gaining a

day in the court of public opinion...A mimeograph machine can't get the message across anymore," reminds one observer.[6]

Similar conditions exist in the other Western democracies, leading Jean Schwoebel of Le Monde to observe that "freedom of expression is given only to people who can assemble formidable capital."[7]

The libertarian and social responsibility theories of the press have failed to account or deal with the decline in democratic participation and plurality of views available in the press, much less the decline in the number of newspapers themselves. As a result, social critics have been forced to reevaluate the newspaper milieu in recent years.

In response to these concerns, two distinct bodies of thought have emerged. The first reflects the traditional liberal democratic view, joined together with the capitalist, free-enterprise philosophy of economics. It holds that the problems of the press are unfortunate, but argues that government must still be prohibited from regulation or any other involvement in the industry if any freedom is to be preserved. The second view is more socially oriented, placing greater significance on preserving the marketplace of ideas and allowing government to take action aimed at preserving and promoting the role of the press in the democratic process. It emerged out of democratic socialist ideology, which developed in Western Europe at the turn of the century, was absorbed into the ideologies of the Social Democratic and Socialist parties and then was revitalized and began spreading throughout the democratic world since the Second World War.

Like the social responsibility theory, the new democratic socialist theory requires the media to open avenues for expression of diverse

ideas and opinions. But it goes further than the social responsibility theory because it views the dangers of private control of an institution important to society as so potentially damaging that they must be ameliorated by instituting other forms of ownership, operation and management of media and state intervention in the economics of the press.

Which of the two views is accepted by any individual depends on the perspective of the individual, say Graham Murdock and Peter Golding.

> The key question becomes one of public intervention or not. The argument is unavoidably political. On one hand the free flow of market forces is viewed as the most justifiable influence on the range and nature of news and views made available by the press. On the other hand such forces are seen as a simple reflection of the distribution of power in society --a distribution which the press therefore comes to represent and thus to reinforce. If this distribution of power is seen as unjust, then so are its consequences, and public and state intervention in the affairs of the press becomes a necessary course of action to rectify such injustice. Which of these views seems correct depends on how one reads the history of the press.[8]

Under the democratic socialist approach, the press' purpose is to provide avenues for expression of views by the public and to fuel political and social debate necessary for the continued development of democratic governance. In this system the state takes action to ensure the ability of citizens to use the press and to preserve and promote media plurality. Ultimately, ownership under such a system would be public and not-for-profit, through foundations, non-profit corporations, journalist-operated cooperatives and other collective organizations.

Democratic Socialist Theory

Support for the state intervention view has grown rapidly in Europe, especially during the late 1960s and the 1970s. Many

governments in the European and Nordic nations have been asked to and agreed to take action in support of a diverse press.[9] These actions include a wide variety of efforts, such as limitations on ownership, protective legislation, development support, exemptions from certain taxes and the granting of subsidies which are consistent with the democratic socialist theory of the press.

The theory departs from the traditional four theories of the press because it is based on a socio-political theory and philosophy that has received its strongest support since the formulation of the four theories paradigm. The democratic socialist theory is a theory for democratic societies, but differs from the libertarian and social responsibility theories because of fundamental differences in the view of the role of state vis-a-vis society. In traditional Anglo-American political sociology, on which the libertarian and social responsibility theories are based, the state is viewed as the enemy of the people and the word state itself had taken on a negative connotation.

In most of the Western democratic world, and in much of the remainder of the democratic world, the state is viewed as a more respected institution, pursuing policies on behalf of its citizens as an open democratic institution, and citizens and other institutions of society are generally supportive of that role. As a result, the state is not viewed with as great suspicion. This is reflected in the political and social institutions and programs of such societies and in citizens' attitudes toward the role of the press. These views have developed to the point they can be seen as a new theory of the press.

This theory of the press has arisen concurrently with evolutionary changes in Western thought and political participation during the last

half-century that have led to a reevaluation of the roles of the individual, the state and other institutions in modern democracies. A hybrid philosophy has developed out of this reconsideration of socio-political theories that reasserts the democratic participation of individuals in all spheres of life that affect them.

The major impetus for this philosophy arose from the changing nature of the relationship between the state and economics caused by the maturation of industrial capitalist society. This relationship has increasingly denied citizens the ability to participate in economic decisions, spurred development of special interest groups and power elites and led to a decline in opportunities to effectively voice opinions, occurrences that have denied citizens the ability to fully participate in political, economic and social decision making.

> ...[T]he separation of economic and political power no longer exists. Widespread market failure has given rise, in this century, to the interventionist state. Routinely shaping, correcting, supplementing and replacing the market mechanism, the interventionist state is explicitly committed to the task of economic decision making. But the expansion of state functions has not been accompanied by a comparably expanded system of popular participation in government. It had, rather, the opposite effect: political decisions have been displaced to an administrative apparatus that is detached from popular control,

two political scientists recently observed.[10]

This occurrence in the United States has mirrored earlier developments in the industrialized democracies of Western Europe. There it spurred consideration of the emerging philosophy that combined the right of democratic participation in political, economic and social spheres of life into a philosophy called democratic socialism (termed economic democracy by those specifically concerned with its economic aspects and

by others who prefer to employ a description that does not include the often misrepresented and misunderstood word "socialist.").

This view of democratic participation in all areas of society arose mainly out of the works of theorists and critics in the highly industrialized Western democratic nations and a few progressive, industrialized socialist states in Eastern Europe.

No single volume has yet provided a comprehensive discussion of democratic socialist ideology or the role of the press in democratic societies operating with such ideology, but a developing body of thought has begun to emerge during the past two decades, building on the turn-of-the century works of early democratic socialists such as Eduard Bernstein.[11] Peter Gay noted the renewed interest in democratic socialism in the 1950s and explored the impact of Bernstein on its ideology in the first major American study, which pointed out the difficulty of trying to bring about radical social changes by democratic means.[12] Michael Harrington, founder of the Democratic Socialists of America, has been the most prolific writer on the subject in the United States and has produced several books that deal with aspects of the philosophy,[13] as has Irving Howe.[14] Journals such as Democracy, The Democratic Left, Dissent and Socialist Review have also carried articles that have contributed to the emerging view of democracy in all spheres of society.

The most significant contributions have emerged from the works on economics by Carole Pateman[15] and Branko Horvat.[16] A variety of other writers have offered paradigms for putting the economic theory into practice, with useful works being produced by Jaroslav Vanek,[17] and Martin Carnoy and Derek Shearer.[18] An introduction to this aspect of democratic socialism was recently published in Journal of Communication

Inquiry. In it, Beverly James broadly and inclusively defined economic democracy as

> ...one element in the vision of a self-governing, self-managing society, a society in which the concept of democracy is extended to embrace all spheres of social life. Its fundamental aim is the construction of a more equitable and democratic society through the democratization of the economic sphere. The same rationale that supports the democratization of politics supports the democratization of economics: a humanistic belief in the inherent rights of all people to intimate, effective participation in major decisions affecting their lives.[19]

This democratic socialist view attempts to blend power elite and pluralist political theory with the class theory of society. This is accomplished by pointing out the debilitating effects of power elites and institutionalized interest groups on the democratic process, while at the same time drawing from the two theories ideas and concepts that support classical democratic constructs--which have already been incorporated with class theory in the formation of basic democratic socialist ideology.[20]

Such an amalgamation of philosophical and ideological concepts into a broadened ideology of democratic socialism is fraught with apparent contradictions, something ideological purists in elite, pluralist and class theory camps hasten to point out. Their criticisms focus on the fact that a pragmatic, activity-oriented ideology is created that does not dogmatically adhere to some of the rather rigid and, oftentimes, dated tenets of class, pluralist, elite and classical democratic theory.

Democratic socialist theory attempts to bridge the schism of political and social theory in modern democratic societies caused by the democratic revolution, which sought to endow man with equality, and the industrial-capitalist revolution, which moved away from equality through

the development and maintenance of distinct social classes, unknown in prior ages, based on capital and employment.

Tom Bottomore describes two stages of the democratic movement that are useful in explaining the the goals of democratic socialism. The first was the revolution which brought about the concept of liberal democracy, a partial democracy that set a competitive political system in place that complemented the growing competitive market economy of developing capitalism. The second stage, he asserted, is the extension of democratic participation to other areas of social life.[21]

A weakness of liberal democracy is its limited scope, which generally permits the democracy to operate only in the political arena and does not extend democratic participation to such areas as the economy or social life in general. This is the first stage of democracy in Bottomore's model and adherents to such philosophy seek to halt democratic development here. They recognize that society may influence the state and should be able to alter it, but reject the concept of the state being allowed to influence and alter society, even if the majority of citizens wish it to do so.

Democratic socialists take a much broader view of democracy, much closer to the classical doctrine which J.A. Schumpter described as a movement that tries to constantly extend the area within which the members of society govern by participating fully in the governance of their lives.[22] This represents the second part of Bottomore's paradigm. Under democratic socialism, society seeks to provide the ability for the second stage of the democratic movement to succeed--the political and social dominance of the most numerous class, the working class, and the transformation of the market economy into a socialist economy.

Democratic socialists, however, are not statist in their approach to society and are critical of centralized bureaucratic administration of economic, political and other aspects of social life as seen in most so-called socialist regimes in the world today. They are also critical of the state monopoly capitalist societies found in Western nations that pursue policies that promote centralization of decision making, bureaucratization and regulation of society by the few.

The difficulties posed by an overriding belief in the democratic process and a belief that fundamental changes need to occur in society present a great "dilemma" to democratic socialists, Gay has rightly pointed out. This means that they are often forced to choose between following their principles, supporting the democratic process and gaining their objectives very slowly, or rejecting principles, seizing power and bringing about immediate changes.[23] In the Western world, democratic socialists have to date chosen principle over power and continue to work for change within existing democratic political institutions.

In the past two decades, social and political scientists in democratic nations have begun to view the evolving tenets of democratic socialism as a possible answer to governmental, economic and social pressures on the press that control the content of messages carried and reduce the opportunity for diverse opinions and views to be disseminated. As a result, many Western democratic societies have permitted their governments to intervene in the marketplace of ideas by taking a variety of steps to maintain and promote media and message plurality, to ensure press accountability to society, to provide public access to the press

and to open avenues for the public and journalists to participate in management decisions.

This concerted intervention in the previously sacrosanct realm of the press was made under the assumption that economic, political and social forces have acted and developed to such a state that they have reduced the opportunity for diverse ideas and opinions to be introduced into the marketplace, a result threatening the very basis of democracy--informed citizen participation.

Mihailo Markovic has also argued the importance of opening communication by removing constraints on ideas and opinions.

> ...The genuine general will of the people can be formed only through open communication, free expression of critical opinions, and dialogue. It is clear then, that any monopoly over the mass media (either by big business, or the church, or the state, or the party) must be dismantled. Such a monopoly enables a ruling elite to manipulate the rest of the population, to create artificial needs, to impose its ideology, and to construe its selfish particular interests as the general ones. Therefore the mass media must be free and genuinely socialized.[24]

Beverly James has laid the groundwork for exploring means of democratizing the economic aspects of media, arguing that self-management and ownership are crucial to making the media more responsive to public needs.[25] Since serious exploration of media from the democratic socialist perspective has only recently begun, her work is useful by pointing out the needs and possible directions for future study.

More recently, James and Hanno Hardt suggested economic democracy as a framework for redefining the nature of the press in Western societies. They argued that governments should strengthen weak newspapers and halt concentration of ownership, and that new types of ownership of newspapers should be encouraged.[26]

Vincent Mosco and Andrew Herman have recently argued that radical and neo-Marxist theories and research on capitalist societies provide methodology for analyzing the communication industry dialectically and that they can be used to provide ideas for democratizing communication in Western nations.[27]

Under the democratic socialist view, media can be truly democratic only if they are removed from the private sector, spared the effects of economic competition, freed from restraints and pressures--whatever the source--and induced to provide the capacity for citizens to communicate effectively with other citizens. These conditions include the requirements of the traditional Western liberal view of press freedom, i.e., the absence of government restraints or undue interference with communication of opinion and viewpoints. But the democratic socialist model combines these negative liberty characteristics, i.e. the absence of governmental restraint and interference, with positive liberty characteristics, i.e., action being taken to promote conditions that will allow a free exchange of ideas among all citizens. This represents a new direction in communication theory, resulting from development of the concept of positive press freedom.[28]

In the realm of communication, democratic socialists attempt to combine their hybrid political ideology with the communication theory of society. The latter theory was introduced in the United States in the 1920s by the "Chicago School," led by theorists such as Charles Horton Cooley and John Dewey, who postulated that the rise of mass democratic politics was made possible by communication media that intricately linked local communities to larger society as a whole.[29]

More recently, that theory has received renewed consideration by members of the "Frankfurt School," made up of critical theorists such as Leo Lowenthal, Theodor Adorno and Jurgen Habermas, who argued that communication media indeed played a significant role in the rise of politics and public discourse, but that in recent years communication media have been the cause of the decline of such mass politics and discourse because of economic and other constraints placed on them that have eroded the prospects of media being used to create a truly democratic society.[30]

This problem was recently addressed by Ed McLuskie, who noted the rising support for viewing

> ...democracy from a communication point of view: this means that democracy is understood as a form of politics animated by and through general public discourse, a politics whereby public discussion and debate are free to make a difference. A necessary condition for the realization of such a politics is that neither society, as a multitude of private interests, nor the state, as the agency for public policy, systematically subordinates general public discourse.[31]

To achieve such a condition would require changing the emphasis of communication from the use of media for one-way, "down" communication from elites, economic interests, etc., to a two-way system based on what could be called "citizen-communicators" and "citizen-receivers-communicators."

Commercial communication media, and even state-operated and controlled media, based on one-way information flow are inimical to the interests of democracy because they inhibit two-way information flow, a basic necessity for the development and maintenance of democratic societies. Without the effective ability for citizens and groups to use media to freely voice their ideas, opinions and concerns, democratic societies cannot survive or further democratic development because

economic, political and class elites are afforded the opportunity to control information and thus shape and direct perceptions and opinions of the masses is ways which reduce diversity of ideas, tolerance of alternate opinions and democratic participation in all aspects of society.

The modern ideal of individual political freedom and participation in the governance of society is only three centuries old and has never remained a static program for democracy, but has been continuously adapted in the environments in which it has operated. Democratic socialists believe in the importance of individual liberty and that such liberty must not be unduly limited by any institutions of society. This ideology, however, departs from the traditional Anglo-American concepts of liberty in that it maintains that individual liberty must be protected not only from state encroachment but also from the encroachment of other individuals and the economic and other institutions of society.

The press is an important aspect of this individual liberty and must not be fettered if individuals are to have the opportunity to seek high degrees of self actualization and participation in society. Ljubomir Tadic points out the integral role media have to play in democratic socialist society:

> An essential need of the workers' movement, therefore is social criticism, which the proletariat rigorously applies to itself as well, in the form of self-criticism. In that sense, the role of the public, the widest political democracy, and freedom of initiative, assembly and the press becomes second nature in socialist society.[32]

Since media are viewed as a crucial institution of society, providing information and a forum for debate, it is understandable that democratizing the media should be a major goal for democratic societies. The importance of a truly free press has been recognized since the

earliest days of socialist thought. Karl Marx himself acknowledged the importance of a free and vigorous press.

> A free press is everywhere the open eye of the national spirit, the embodied confidence of the people in itself, the verbal bond that ties the individual to the state and the world, the incorporated culture which transforms material struggles into spiritual struggles and idealizes the crude materialized form. It is the heedless confession a people before itself, and confession, as is known, has liberating power. It is the spiritual mirror in which the people observe themselves, and self-observation is the first condition of wisdom. It is the spirit of the state which can be carried into every hut, cheaper than material gas. It is versatile, the most modern and all knowing. It is the ideal world which always originates in the real world and flows into it again, giving life, as an ever richer spirit,

he observed. But he also recognized that such a free press was not without problems. "Bear in mind," Marx said, "that the advantages of freedom of the press cannot be enjoyed without toleration of its inconveniences. There are no roses without thorns."[33]

The democratic socialist theory of the press has been drawn from suggestions for improving the press that have been offered by a wide variety of individuals with a wide range of ideological backgrounds. It incorporates libertarian, liberal and socialist views of press freedom and requirements of the press in democratic society to form its philosophy and define its requirements.

It is a distinctly different view of the press than that offered by other theories of the press. Under the democratic socialist theory the press are not an instrument for private owners--as they are under libertarian, social responsibility and authoritarian theories--or of the government--as they are under the Soviet/communist theory of the press. Instead, under democratic socialist theory, media are viewed as instrument of the people, public utilities through which their aspirations, ideas and criticisms of the state and society may be disseminated.

This view presupposes that in democracies freedom of the press is a right of the people, not a privilege provided solely to those who own or control the means of conveying information. Freedom of the press is viewed as an extension of the right of free expression, providing the ability to express views fully without restraints being imposed by any elite. In the early stages of most democratic societies, the major enemy to such liberty is viewed as government, which has exercised considerable restraint of the press in the past. Not surprisingly, when social and political philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke posited their views on democratic society, they saw government as an inherent threat and supported the ideas of negative liberty, particularly in relation to the process of expression.

Proponents of positive press freedom actions now view Western society after more than two centuries of democratic tradition and see new and rising dangers to the democratic process that are every bit as threatening as an unsympathetic state. Rousseau argued that society may enter areas of liberty from which it normally separates itself in order to promote greater societal interests. Supporters of positive press freedom extend this argument to say that the state must step in to adjust the structures and economic systems of privately-owned media, even if it requires compelling them to act against their wishes, to ensure the means by which the democratic process of individual expression can operate.

The democratic socialist view of press freedom attempts to take into account the variety of limitations possible on liberty and seeks to reduce them--whatever their source. The expanded view of press freedom under the democratic socialist theory of the press attempts to ensure

citizen equality in voicing opinions and viewpoints and in efforts to play a significant part in the decisions of a democratic society.

At its highest level of development, the democratic socialist theory would remove media from private ownership (opting for some form of societal or non-profit operation), would ensure public access, newsroom autonomy and democracy and media plurality and would shield the press from economic, governmental and social restraints that act to reduce the diversity of ideas and opinions available.[34]

The fear of government pressure and control diminishing freedom of expression is not without basis, but neither is fear of diminished freedom of expression caused by economic pressures and controls. Proponents of democratic socialism believe that the effects of diminished freedom of expression from either of these causes is equally damaging and reduces the ability of citizens to seek self determination through the democratic process.

To sit by idly arguing that government should not interfere in the press in order to preserve press freedom, while economics, pressure groups and newspaper owners actively destroy the basic requirements of press freedom is counterproductive and leads to a continuing loss of press freedom. Of all the institutions of society, only government has the ability to step into the breech and halt the loss of press freedom.

A more critical evaluation of democratic socialist efforts, however, requires one to point out that proponents currently accept press systems based on private ownership, operated for the purpose of acquiring profit, although democratic socialists eventually hope to remove media from private hands. Despite the apparently democratic arguments for present state intervention in the marketplace of ideas, such aid

cannot be wholly praised and accepted by democratic socialists since it does not strike at the heart of the issue--private ownership of an essential institution of society. At best, current state intervention is a vehicle by which media plurality can be preserved and a temporary means of sustaining some press freedom. This once again typifies the dilemma democratic socialists face because of their ideology of evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, change in democratic societies.

How one views the efforts to implement the democratic socialist theory of the press is inherently wrapped up in the questions of political and social ideology. If one believes in an unfettered free enterprise system and that only government can truly threaten press freedom, the democratic socialist theory will be viewed as a severe restraint on and interference in the marketplace. If one is a supporter of even the social responsibility theory, the democratic socialist alternative will also be unpalatable since it puts even less faith in the idea that truth will ultimately triumph in the commercial marketplace of ideas. An uncompromising socialist will likewise disapprove of such efforts since they accept a middle ground not requiring media to be immediately wrested from private hands.

The middle course selected by the proponents of democratic socialism is not surprising, however, since the view developed and was first implemented in nations pursuing state capitalism and "responsible" competitive strategies. The blending of ideologies into the new theory can be viewed as a step in the direction of popular access to and control of the media, a development that may lead to true democratic ownership and operation of the means of disseminating information and opinion in the future.

NOTES

1. Anthony Smith, "State Intervention and the Management of the Press," in J. Curran, ed., The British Press: A Manifesto (London: MacMillian, 1978), p. 72.

2. Fred Siebert, T. Peterson, and W. Schramm, Four Theories of the Press (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1956).

3. Patrick Parsons, "Economics of the Newspaper Industry: A Marxian Analysis" (M.A. Thesis, California State University, Northridge, 1978).

4. Lars Engwall, "Newspaper Concentration: A Case for Theories of Oligopoly," Scandinavian Economic History Review 29 (Fall 1981), pp. 145-154.

5. George Koether, "Free Market and Free Press," Freedom of Information Center Report no. 31 (July 1960), p. 1.

6. Hazel Henderson, "Access to the Media: A Problem in Democracy" Columbia Journalism Review (Spring 1969), p. 6.

7. Jean Schwoebel, "The Miracle 'Le Monde' Wrought," Columbia Journalism Review (Summer 1970), p. 8-9.

8. Graham Murdock and Peter Golding, "The Structure, Ownership and Control of the Press, 1914-76," in G. Boyce, et. al (eds.) Newspaper History (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1978), p. 148.

9. Since the early 1960s, and especially in the early 1970s, a large number of government commissions have studied the economic problems of the press and recommended actions on its behalf. Most studies are unavailable in English, but can be acquired in the language of the nation in which they originated.

10. Thomas Ferguson and Joel Rogers, "Oligopoly in the Idea Market," The Nation 233 (October 3, 1981), p. 303.

11. Eduard Bernstein, Evolutionary Socialism, trans. Edith C. Harvey (New York: Schocken Books, 1961).

12. Peter Gay, The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

13. Especially useful are Toward a Democratic Left (New York: MacMillian, 1968), The Twilight of Capitalism (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976) and Decade of Decision: The Crisis of the American System (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980).

14. See Steady Work: Essays in the Politics of Democratic Radicalism, 1953-66 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966); I. Howe, ed., Twenty-Five Years of Dissent (New York: Methuen, 1979); The Radical Imagination: An Anthology from Dissent Magazine (New York: New American Library, 1967); Beyond the New Left (New York: McCall Publishing Co.,

1970); and I. Howe and M. Harrington, eds., The Seventies: Problems and Proposals (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

15. Carole Pateman, Participation and Democratic Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

16. Branko Horvat, Milhailo Markovic and Rudi Supek, eds., Self-Governing Socialism, 2 vols. (White Plains, N.Y.: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1975).

17. Jaroslav Vanek, The Participatory Economy: An Evolutionary Hypothesis and a Strategy for Development (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1971) and Self Management: Economic Liberation of Man (Baltimore: Penquin, 1975).

18. Martin Carnoy and Derek Shearer, Economic Democracy: The Challenge of the 1980s (White Plains, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1980).

19. Beverly James, "Economic Democracy and Restructuring the Press," Journal of Communication Inquiry 6 (Winter 1981), p. 121.

20. A discussion of the general natures of the three major approaches--pluralist, elite and class--are found in Robert Alford, "Paradigms of Relations Between State and Society," in L. Lindberg, ed., Stress and Contradictions in Modern Capitalism (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976).

21. Tom Bottomore, Political Sociology (New York: Harper and Row, 1979).

22. J.A. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, 5th ed. (London: Allen and Unwin, 1976).

23. Gay, 1952.

24. Mihailo Markovic, "Philosophical Foundations of the Idea of Self-Management," p. 331, in Horvat, et. al, eds., Self-Governing Socialism, 1975.

25. James, 1981.

26. Hanno Hardt and Beverly James, "Newspapers and Western Democracies: Towards a Participatory Model of the Press." A paper presented to the National Conference of the Society of Educators and Scholars, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, October 1-2, 1981.

27. Vincent Mosco and Andrew Herman, "Radical Social Theory and the Communications Revolution," pp. 58-84, in Emile G. McAnany, Jorge Schnitman and Noreene Janus, eds., Communication and Social Structure New York: Praeger, 1981).

28. Robert G. Picard, "Promoting Democracy: Development of the Theory of Positive Press Freedom." A paper presented to the National Conference of the Society of Educators and Scholars, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, October 1-2, 1981.

29. John Dewey, The Public and Its Problems (Denver: Swallow Press, 1916) and Democracy and Education (New York: Free Press, 1922). See also Charles Horton Cooley, Social Organization (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1909).

30. For a general discussion of the Frankfurt School's view of media, see Nicholas Petryszak, "The Frankfurt School's Theory of Manipulation," Journal of Communication 27 (Summer 1977), pp. 33-40. For a more specific view of communication and society, see Jurgen Habermas, Communication and the Evolution of Society (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978). See also Jurgen Habermas, Strukturwandel der Offentlichkeit (Neuwied: Herman Luchterhand Verlag, 1962). An English synopsis, trans. by Sara and Frank Lennox, is "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)" New German Critique 3 (Fall 1974), pp. 49-55.

31. Ed McLuskie, "Systematic Constraints on Prospects for a Democratic Society: Basic Considerations from the Communication Theory of Society." A paper presented to the National Conference of the Society of Educators and Scholars, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, October 1-2, 1981.

32. Ljubomir Tadic, "Order and Freedom," p. 414, in Horvat, et. al, eds., Self-Governing Socialism, 1975.

33. Karl Marx, Rheinische Zeitung no. 135 (May 15, 1842).

34. Robert G. Picard, "The Democratic Socialist Hierarchy of Press Freedom Needs," Journal of Communication Inquiry (forthcoming).